







United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/371,760 08/10/1999		TOMOYUKI FUNAKI	25484.00750	9629	
25224	7590	08/12/2002			
MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP				EXAMINER	
555 WEST FIFTH STREET SUITE 3500				NOLAN, DANIEL A	
LOS ANGI	LOS ANGELES, CA 90013-1024			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2654	
				DATE MAILED: 08/12/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)	_)			
	0.55	09/371,760	FUNAKI, TOMOYUKI	•			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Daniel A. Nolan	2654	_			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
THE I - External after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti bly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror e, cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed bys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05</u>	<u>August 2002</u> .					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ TI	his action is non-final.					
3) <u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under						
·	on of Claims Claim(s) <u>4-10,12,13 and 15-28</u> is/are pending	r in the application					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra						
	Claim(s) <u>12,13 and 15-21</u> is/are allowed.	THE NOTE OF TOTAL COLUMN					
·	Claim(s) <u>4-10 and 22-28</u> is/are rejected.						
7)□							
′=	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
,	on Papers	•					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)🛛	The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 1999 is/are:	a)⊠ accepted or b)☐ objected to	by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)[The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)□ approved b)□ disappr	oved by the Examiner.				
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	eply to this Office action.					
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer.					
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		•				
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received in Applica	tion No				
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pric application from the International Bo See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	-				
14) 🗌 A	acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	tic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(e) (to a provisional application).				
) \square The translation of the foreign language pr Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	- · ·					
Attachmen	t(s)						
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Information	ry (PTO-413) Paper No(s). <u>18</u> . I Patent Application (PTO-152)				
S. Patent and T	rademark Office			_			



Art Unit: 2641

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Amendment

- 2. The amendment filed 5 August 2002 was entered to the following effect:
 - Claims 1, 11 and 14 were cancelled and the rejections withdrawn as moot.
 - Claim 4 was changed to be dependent on claim 22.
 - Claims 22-28 were added and examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Teany

4. Claims 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being directly anticipated by Teany (U.S. Patent 5,171,930).



Art Unit: 2641

5. Regarding claims 22, 24 & 26 and 23, 25 & 27, <u>Teany</u> (column 2 lines 19-21) reads on the features of *extracting volume* and *extracting pitch*. Both features of *volume* and *pitch* are combined to read on the feature of *threshold* values (as in column 5 line 11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Kohler

- 6. Claims 22-28 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohler (U.S. Patent 6,140,568).
- 7. Regarding claims 22-27, <u>Kohler</u> claims in his claim 1 the specific features of receiving signals, extracting characteristics (decomposing) and setting parameters.
- 8. Regarding claims 22, 24 and 26, <u>Kohler</u> employs a MIDI converter to process *volume* (column 3 line 62) and further uses that MIDI to set *thresholds* (column 5 lines 10-12).

While <u>Kohler</u> does not specifically mention setting a *volume threshold* because he qualifies the above referenced disclosure as examples (bottom of column 4), it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of signal processing at the time



Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/371,760

Art Unit: 2641

of the invention to put the volume threshold detection mechanism at that point to start, continue and stop processing as shown by <u>Kohler</u> in figures 9 & 10.

- 9. Regarding claims 23, 25 and 27, Kohler describes filtering out non-pitched content (column 3 lines 52-55). While not specifying upper and lower pitch limits, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of signal processing at the time of the invention to establish limits beyond which and less than which a signal would be considered.
- 10. Regarding claims 4 and 28, the claims are set forth with the same limitations as claims 22 and 23, respectively. Kohler represents a *display* in figure 2 for presenting information to the user/operator (column 10 line 41).
- 11. Regarding claim 5, the claim is set forth with the same limitations as claim 4. Kohler claims direct control of the parameters (3rd feature of claim 30) enabled by the keyboard (column 10 line 26).

Kohler & Humphrey⁷⁵ et al

12. Claims 6-10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohler in view of Humphrey⁷⁵ *et al* (U.S. Patent 3,894,186).







Art Unit: 2641

13. Regarding claim 6, Kohler discloses the features of *Input* (addressed in response to claim 1) and *pitch extracting* (*ibid.* responding to claim 3).

Kohler further discloses the means to *determine notes* (column 3 line 47) using *pitch* with the recognizer (item 400, figure 1) in response to prior attempts (last paragraph of column 1 through column 2 line 35) more successfully (in figure 16 items 421284-421286).

Kohler does not disclose a *scale designation section* to correlate the above note determination with the values of a scale. Humphrey⁷⁵ et al explicitly assigns notes by activation of a visual device in reaction to pitch values (last paragraph of column 9). Because Kohler, Humphrey⁷⁵ et al and the immediate invention strive to present audio signals in visual form, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of signal processing at the time of the invention to employ a well known coding scheme such as musical notation and its attendant scale rather than to attempt to train operators in technical representation.

14. Regarding claim 7, the claim is set forth with the same features as claim 6. While Kohler does not deal with presentation using a scale and so would not be expected to address the use of different scales, Humphrey⁷⁵ et al teaches the characteristics of the scales (in column 4 lines 42-45) as being either diatonic or chromatic of 7- or 12-tones, respectively.





Page 6

Application/Control Number: 09/371,760

Art Unit: 2641

- 15. Regarding claim 8, the claim is set forth with the same features as claim 7. While Kohler does not deal with presentation using a chromatic scale and so would not address the matter of assigning *diatonic* or *intermediate* notes. Humphrey⁷⁵ et al recognizes the possibility of implementing either scale (starting at the 6th line from the end of column 20 and in the 1st paragraph of column 24).
- 16. Regarding claim 9, the claim is set forth with the same features as claim 8. While Kohler does not deal with presentation on a musical scale and so would not address the matter of assigning *diatonic* or *intermediate* notes. Humphrey⁷⁵ et al recognizes that different representations could be used, changing the number of output or display elements (column 24 2nd paragraph). Further, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in signal processing at the time of the invention that dealing with a signal with finite limits increasing the number of elements will the narrow the intervals between them, or pitch extremes, and reducing the number of division will broaden the pitch limits.
- 17. Regarding claim 10, the claim is set forth with the same features as claim 6.

 Kohler teaches that note length and specific minimums (column 21 lines 29-32) validate a note. This minimum note length corresponds to the unit of the claim as being the lowest amount that is considered. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in signal processing at the time of the invention that the predominant basis for established equivalence scales and measures is the smallest recognizable part.

Art Unit: 2654

Allowable Subject Matter

- 18. Claims 12, 13, and 15-21 are allowed.
- 19. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:
 - Regarding claims 12, 15, 17, 19 and 20; the features of *input*, *pitch extracting* and the means to *determine notes* using *pitch* are the same as those for claim 6 and 3, the ability to use different scales to represent processing is neither anticipated nor has it been found in an obvious combination in the prior art of record.
 - Claims 13, 16, 18 and 21 depend on claims which have been found to be allowable and so do they become allowable as a result.

Conclusion

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).



Art Unit: 2641

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

- 21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - Shudo (U.S. Patent 6,035,009) reads on extracting volume parameters (10-12 in figures 1 & 3).
 - Carlson et al (U.S. Patent 4,777,649) reads on establishing pitch thresholds (24, 25, 63 in figure 8).
- 22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Daniel A. Nolan at telephone (703) 305-1368 whose normal business hours are Mon, Tue, Thu & Fri, from 7 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to contact the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold, can be reached at (703) 305-4379.

Art Unit: 2641

Page 9

The fax phone number for Technology Center 2600 is (703) 872-9314. Label informal and draft communications as "DRAFT" or "PROPOSED", & designate formal communications as "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE".

Formal response to this action may be faxed according to the above instructions,

or mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or hand-delivered to:

Crystal Park 2.

2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA,

Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Technolocy Center 2600 Customer Service Office at telephone number (703) 306-0377.

Daniel A. Nolan Examiner Art Unit 2654

dan

August 9, 2002

VIJAY CHAWAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

lijay Bhawan 8/9/02